

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Office Action dated 16 June 2008. Responsive to that Office Action, Claim 1 has been amended, and dependent Claims 7-8 newly-inserted for further prosecution with the other pending Claims. It is believed that with such amendment and insertion of Claims, there is a further clarification of the Claims' recitations.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the Nagane, et al. reference.

As newly-amended independent Claim 1 now more clearly recites, Applicants' scanner includes among its combinations of features an LED lamp set "disposed within a cavity defined by a supporting structure." This supporting structure includes "a plurality of walls projecting about opposing sides of said LED lamp set," so as "to bound an optical path between said LED lamp set and a transparent plate" against which the object to be scanned is placed.

In certain embodiments, a "rod lens" is provided to refract and focus the light emitted from the LED lamp set, as Claim 3 recites. Moreover, this rod lens is in certain embodiments "disposed between said support structure walls bounding said optical path of said LED lamp set," so as "to enclose said cavity of said support structure" in which the LED lamp set is held, as newly-inserted dependent Claim 7 recites. In the disclosed embodiment, such rod lens is "elliptical in sectional contour," as newly-inserted dependent Claim 8 adds.

The full combinations of these and other features now more clearly recited by Applicants' pending Claims is nowhere disclosed by the cited Nagane, et al. reference. The LED chip in Nagane, et al.'s device is simply placed upon a flat metal plate, with a condenser lens disposed over top, as the reference specifies for each of its disclosed embodiments. Nowhere does Nagane, et al. disclose a structure in which the LED chip is actually disposed "within a cavity defined by a supporting structure," whose "plurality of walls project[] about opposing sides of ...[an] LED lamp set to bound an optical path" it defines to the given transparent plate (as newly-amended independent Claim 1 now more clearly recites). Nor does Nagane, et al. anywhere disclose such features as a rod lens being "disposed between said supporting structure walls," much less with the particular structure recited therefore by newly-inserted dependent Claims 7 and 8. It prescribes instead a block-type condenser lens formed with particular configuration shown so that it may effectively wrap around the plate-mounted LED chip.

It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that the cited Nagane, et al. reference fails to disclose the unique combinations of features now more clearly recited by Applicants' pending Claims for the purposes and objectives disclosed in the subject Patent Application.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed fully in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

MR2847-3
Serial Number: 10/798,392
Response to Office Action dated 16 June 2008

If there are any further charges associated with this filing, the Honorable Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account #18-2011 for such charges.

Respectfully submitted,
For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE



Jun Y. Lee
Registration No.: 40,262
Dated: 9/19/2008

Rosenberg, Klein & Lee
3458 Ellicott Center Dr.
Suite 101
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678
Customer No.: 04586